

REMARKS

1. We thank the examiner for allowing claims 59-61, 63-65, 69-96 (OA §4).

2. We have cancelled claim 66, so the enablement rejection stated in OA §3 is moot.

3. We have cancelled claim 62 and replaced it with new claim 97, in view of 1) the inconsistent use of underlining in the original claim, 2) the Examiner's concern with any use of underlining other than to indicate new text in an amended claim, and 3) the examiner's concern with the use of capitalization to differentiate D- and L-amino acids. This moots the indefiniteness rejection (OA §2).

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper  
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528  
IPC:lms  
G:\ipc\n-q\Plou\Ploug1\pto amend.wpd